

REGULAR WEEKLY SESSION-----ROANOKE CITY COUNCIL

January 16, 2001

12:15 p.m.

The Council of the City of Roanoke met in regular session on Tuesday, January 16, 2001, at 12:15 p.m., in the City Council Chamber, fourth floor, Noel C. Taylor Municipal Building, 215 Church Avenue, S. W., City of Roanoke, Virginia, with Mayor Ralph K. Smith presiding, pursuant to Chapter 2, Administration, Article II, City Council, Section 2-15, Rules of Procedure, Rule 1, Regular Meetings, Code of the City of Roanoke (1979), as amended.

PRESENT: Council Members William D. Bestpitch, William H. Carder, C. Nelson Harris, W. Alvin Hudson, Jr., William White, Sr., Linda F. Wyatt and Mayor Ralph K. Smith-----7.

ABSENT: None-----0.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Darlene L. Burcham, City Manager; William M. Hackworth, City Attorney; James D. Grisso, Director of Finance; and Mary F. Parker, City Clerk.

CITY COUNCIL : A communication from the City Attorney requesting a Closed Meeting to consult with legal counsel on a matter of actual litigation, pursuant to Section 2.1-344 (A)(7), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended, was before the body.

Mr. Carder moved that Council concur in the request of the City Attorney to convene in a Closed Meeting to consult with legal counsel on a matter of actual litigation, pursuant to Section 2.1-344 (A)(7), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended. The motion was seconded by Mr. Harris and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Bestpitch, Carder, Harris, Hudson, White, Wyatt and Mayor Smith-----7.

NAYS: None-----0.

CITY COUNCIL-INDUSTRIES: A communication from the City Manager requesting a Closed Meeting to discuss a prospective business, where no previous announcement of the interest of the business in locating its facilities in the City has been made, pursuant to Section 2.1-344 (A)(5), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended, was before the body.

Mr. Carder moved that Council concur in the request of the City Manager to convene in a Closed Meeting to discuss a prospective business, where no previous announcement of the interest of the business in locating its facilities in the City has been made, pursuant to Section 2.1-344 (A)(5), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hudson and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Bestpitch, Carder, Harris, Hudson, White, Wyatt and Mayor Smith-----7.

NAYS: None-----0.

COMMITTEES-CITY COUNCIL: A communication from the Honorable Ralph K. Smith, Mayor, requesting a Closed Meeting to discuss vacancies on various authorities, boards, commissions and committees appointed by Council, pursuant to Section 2.1-344 (A)(1), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended, was before the body.

Mr. Hudson moved that Council concur in the request of the Mayor to convene in a Closed Meeting to discuss vacancies on various authorities, boards, commissions and committees appointed by Council, pursuant to Section 2.1-344 (A)(1), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended. The motion was seconded by Mr. Carder and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Bestpitch, Carder, Harris, Hudson, White, Wyatt and Mayor Smith-----7.

NAYS: None-----0.

CITY COUNCIL-CITY EMPLOYEES: A communication from the Honorable C. Nelson Harris, Chair, City Council Personnel Committee, requesting a Closed Meeting to discuss the performance of three Council-Appointed Officers, pursuant to Section 2.1-344 (A)(1), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended, was before the body.

Mr. Carder moved that Council concur in the request of Council Member Harris to convene in a Closed Meeting to discuss the performance of three Council-Appointed Officers, pursuant to Section 2.1-344 (A)(1), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended. The motion was seconded by Mr. Harris and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Bestpitch, Carder, Harris, Hudson, White, Wyatt and Mayor Smith-----7.

NAYS: None-----0.

At 12:20 p.m., Mayor Smith declared the meeting in recess and the Council reconvened in the Council's Conference Room for four Closed Sessions.

At 2:00 p.m., on Tuesday, January 16, 2001, the regular meeting of Council reconvened in the City Council Chamber, fourth floor, Noel C. Taylor Municipal Building, 215 Church Avenue, S. W., City of Roanoke, Virginia, with Mayor Ralph K. Smith presiding, pursuant to Chapter 2, Administration, Article II, City Council, Section 2-15, Rules of Procedure, Rule 1, Regular meetings, Code of the City of Roanoke (1979), as amended.

PRESENT: Council Members William D. Bestpitch, William H. Carder, C. Nelson Harris, W. Alvin Hudson, Jr., William White, Sr., Linda F. Wyatt and Mayor Ralph K. Smith-----7.

ABSENT: None-----0.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Darlene L. Burcham, City Manager; William M. Hackworth, City Attorney; James D. Grisso, Director of Finance; and Mary F. Parker, City Clerk.

The reconvened meeting was opened with a prayer by Council Member C. Nelson Harris.

The Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America was led by Mayor Smith.

CONSENT AGENDA

The Mayor advised that all matters listed under the Consent Agenda were considered to be routine by the Members of Council and would be enacted by one motion in the form, or forms, listed on the Consent Agenda, and if discussion was desired, that item would be removed from the Consent Agenda and considered separately. The Mayor called attention to a request for a Closed Session to discuss a prospective business where no previous announcement of the interest of the business in locating its facilities in the City has been made.

BUDGET: A communication from the City Manager recommending that the following proposed budget schedule for fiscal year 2001-02 (Option 1) be adopted:

- April 16, 2001 Public presentation of Fiscal Year 2001-02
2:00 p.m. recommended budget to City Council by City
Manager. (Regular meeting of City Council.)

- **April 23, 2001** **Public hearing on recommended budget. (Special meeting of City Council.)**
7:00 p.m.
- **April 25 – 26, 2001** **City Council budget work sessions.**
8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.
- **May 7, 2001** **City Council adopts General Fund, Proprietary Fund, and School Fund budgets, approves an annual appropriation ordinance, and adopts the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Consolidated Plan. (Regular meeting of City Council.)**
2:00 p.m.

Mr. Harris moved that Council concur in the recommendation of the City Manager. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hudson and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Bestpitch, Carder, Harris, Hudson, White, Wyatt and Mayor Ralph K. Smith-----7.

NAYS: None-----0.

ANNUAL REPORTS-REAL ESTATE VALUATION: A communication from the Director of Real Estate Valuation advising that as prescribed by law, the Office of Real Estate Valuation has completed the Annual General Reassessment Program for fiscal year 2001-02; "Change of Assessment Notices" were mailed to property owners on January 19, 2001; and the real estate tax base increased approximately 3.5 per cent due to this year's annual reassessment, which figure is subject to appeals and excludes new construction, was before Council.

It was further advised that new construction will add another 1.9 per cent to the tax base, which represents \$30 million of residential and \$43 million of commercial construction; adjusted downward for the tax abatement on the Higher Education Center, this year's new construction activity is equivalent to that which occurred last year; and overall, the general reassessment program and new construction indicate growth of 5.4 per cent in the real estate tax base to July 1, 2001, which is up from last year's 4.5 per cent rate.

It was explained that unlike the financial markets, growth in real estate values has remained steady during this past year; values will be adjusted for tax freezes, tax abatements and other miscellaneous items to arrive at a revenue estimate for the next fiscal year; individual property assessments vary widely from the City-wide average of 3.5 per cent; most assessment changes will range from three per cent to

made to the property during the year that increased its value, the property owner may receive a higher increase; and assessment appeals will be conducted from January 19 through February 15, 2001.

Mr. Harris moved that the report be received and filed. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hudson and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Bestpitch, Carder, Harris, Hudson, White, Wyatt and Mayor Smith-----7.

NAYS: None-----0.

BLUE RIDGE COMMUNITY SERVICE: A communication from Rodney P. Furr, Chair, Blue Ridge Community Services Board of Directors, requesting Council's concurrence in the reappointment of John M. Hudgins, for a term ending December 31, 2003, as an at-large member of the Blue Ridge Community Services Board of Directors, was before the body.

Mr. Harris moved that Council concur in the reappointment of John M. Hudgins as above described. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hudson and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Bestpitch, Carder, Harris, Hudson, White, Wyatt and Mayor Smith-----7.

NAYS: None-----0.

COMMITTEES-ROANOKE ARTS COMMISSION: A communication from Rita D. Bishop tendering her resignation as a member of the Roanoke Arts Commission, effective immediately, was before Council.

Mr. Harris moved that Council accept the resignation and receive and file the communication. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hudson and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Bestpitch, Carder, Harris, Hudson, White, Wyatt and Mayor Smith-----7.

NAYS: None-----0.

COMMITTEES-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: The following reports of qualification were before Council:

Phillip F. Sparks as a member of the Economic Development Commission, for a term ending June 30, 2003; and

Pam Kestner-Chappelear as a member of the Human Services Committee, for a term ending June 30, 2001.

Mr. Harris moved that the reports of qualification be received and filed. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hudson and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Bestpitch, Carder, Harris, Hudson, White, Wyatt and Mayor Smith-----7.

NAYS: None-----0.

CITY COUNCIL-INDUSTRIES: A communication from the City Manager requesting that Council convene in a Closed Meeting to discuss a prospective business where no previous announcement of the interest of the business in locating its facilities in the City has been made, pursuant to Section 2.1-344(A)(5), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended, was before the body.

Mr. Harris moved that Council concur in the request of the City Manager to convene in a Closed Meeting to discuss a prospective business where no previous announcement of the interest of the business in locating its facilities in the City has been made, pursuant to Section 2.1-344(A)(5), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hudson and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Bestpitch, Carder, Harris, Hudson, White, Wyatt and Mayor Smith-----7.

NAYS: None-----0.

REGULAR AGENDA

HEARING OF CITIZENS UPON PUBLIC MATTERS: NONE.

PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS:

COMMITTEES-RAIL SERVICE: David A. Bowers, Chair, Passenger Rail Service Committee, advised that the Committee is dedicated to bringing passenger rail service back to the City of Roanoke; Roanokers want a convenient and cheaper alternative to their transportation; the City of Roanoke has a long history with the railroad dating back to the mid-1850's; and the Committee recommends the following: (1) designate the Norfolk and Western Passenger Station on Shenandoah Avenue, S. W., across from The Hotel Roanoke as the future site for the Passenger

Rail Depot Terminal; (2) refer a request that \$1.25 million be committed, in addition to the \$250,000.00 already committed, for the purchase of the Norfolk and Western Passenger Station from Center In The Square, for a total of \$1.5 million, to 2002-03 budget study; and (3) commit funds for renovation of the Norfolk and Western Passenger Station, if designated as the depot site.

Mr. Bowers added that other issues are under consideration by the Committee, including the prospect of additional excursions to the Roanoke area,; and the Committee supports Congressmen Rick Boucher and Bob Goodlatte's request for a \$25 million funding of AMTRAK, the State service railroad, TransDominion Express, to Roanoke, as an option to subsidize such services. He stated that the Committee recommends that funds be allocated for development of the passenger rail depot.

James Sears, President, Center in the Square, spoke in support of renovation of the former historic Norfolk and Western Passenger Station, and advised that the passenger station could serve as the headquarters for the Roanoke Valley Convention and Visitors Bureau, as well as a gallery in recognition of the industrial architect and designer, Raymond Lowey. He further advised that the History Museum of Western Virginia and Center in the Square are negotiating with the O. Winston Link Foundation to house the black and white photography of O. Winston Link and many of his artifacts, which would be a major cultural draw and tourist attraction; and the 1218 steam engine will be donated to the City of Roanoke as a part of the Passenger Station exhibit, and ultimately will be relocated to the Virginia Museum of Transportation.

Bill Arnold, a member of the Roanoke Chapter of the National Railway Historical Society, advised that approximately 50,000 people rode the 611 steam engine excursions to and from Roanoke between 1982 and November 1994; a number of railway chapters enjoyed stopping in Roanoke as a turn around; and Abbott Tours has established an AMTRAK excursion via a bus to Washington, D.C., and returning by AMTRAK to Lynchburg, Virginia.

Mr. Arnold further advised that the Roanoke Chapter has submitted an application to AMTRAK for an excursion this year, but final approval must be granted by Norfolk Southern Corporation. He encouraged the Members of Council to support the excursion and to assist Downtown Roanoke, Inc., with marketing.

Mr. Harris moved that the recommendations of the Passenger Rail Service Committee be referred to the City Manager for report to Council. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hudson.

Mr. White suggested that funding items be referred to fiscal year 2002-03 budget study.

Mr. Harris amended the motion to provide that designation of the former Norfolk Southern Passenger Station on Shenandoah Avenue as the future site of a passenger rail depot and appropriation of funds for renovation of the passenger rail station be referred to fiscal year 2001-02 budget study. The amendment to the motion was seconded by Mr. Hudson and unanimously adopted.

The motion, as above amended, was unanimously adopted.

INDUSTRIES-EQUIPMENT-D-DAY MEMORIAL: A communication from Michael W. Graff, Jr., representing the Industrial Development Authority of the City of Harrisonburg, Virginia, requesting concurrence in a resolution adopted by the Authority, and approval of a loan for the benefit of the Virginia Public Broadcasting Board, to assist in financing the acquisition of certain equipment for conversion of Virginia's public television stations to the new digital standard of the Federal Communications Commission, was before Council.

It was stated that the IDA of Harrisonburg is assisting Virginia Public Television Stations with a financing for equipment required for the Federal Communications Commission's mandated conversion to a digital broadcast standard; under the IDA statute, the governing body of each locality in which the equipment will be located must concur in a inducement resolution for financing; and approximately \$1,500,000.00 worth of new equipment will be used by Blue Ridge Public Television at its McNeil Drive facility in the City of Roanoke.

Mr. White offered the following resolution:

(#35183-011601) A RESOLUTION concurring in the resolution adopted by the Industrial Development Authority of the City of Harrisonburg, Virginia (the "Harrisonburg Authority"), and approving the loan by the Harrisonburg Authority for the benefit of the Virginia Public Broadcasting Board (the "VPBB") to assist in financing the acquisition of certain equipment for the conversion of Virginia's public television stations to the Federal Communication Commission's new digital standard (the "Project").

(For full text of Resolution, see Resolution Book No. 64, page 84.)

Mr. White moved the adoption of Resolution No. 35183-011601. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hudson and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Bestpitch, Carder, Harris, Hudson, White, Wyatt and Mayor Smith-----7.

NAYS: None-----0.

BUDGET-SCHOOLS: A communication from the Roanoke City School Board requesting that Council approve the following appropriations, was before the body.

\$43,219.00 from the 2000-01 Capital Maintenance and Equipment Replacement Funds for division-wide instructional technology, for facility maintenance needs, for soil testing for modular classroom placements, for handicap restroom modifications at Ruffner Middle School, and for magnet furniture at Westside Elementary School.

\$15,358.00 to provide Quality Zone Academy Bond (QZAB) funding for legal services for the issuance of bonds for the Roanoke Academy for Mathematics and Science facility.

\$1,500.00 for the Special Education Assistive Technology program to provide funds for the purchase of equipment and software to assist students with disabilities, to be reimbursed 100 per cent by Federal funds.

\$170,173.00 for the Special Education Jail program to provide funds for the salary and expenses of the staff providing special education instruction and screening services to inmates, to be reimbursed 100 per cent by State funds.

\$213,317.00 for the Goals 2000 Technology grant to provide funds for purchase of classroom computers and related technologies, to be reimbursed 100 per cent by Federal funds.

\$300.00 for the Arts Incentive Grant for Madison Middle School to help strengthen the arts program at Madison and to encourage innovative arts programs, to be funded with Federal funds.

\$53,300.00 for the Technology Literacy Challenge grant to provide individual competencies and training in instructional technology to 220 teachers in grades K-2 in order to improve the academic and technological achievement of the district's primary students, to be funded with Federal funds.

\$15,000.00 for the Chess program to pay for chess materials and tournament participation costs, to be funded with a private donation.

\$10,000.00 for the Expanded GED Testing Services program to establish a satellite GED test center at the Virginia Employment Commission and expand testing services in the Roanoke City testing area, to be reimbursed 100 per cent by State funds.

\$806,000.00 for the School Instructional Technology program to be used for the purchase of school instructional technology equipment which will enable students in grades nine through twelve to take the Standards of Learning (SOL) test on-line, to 100 per cent reimbursed by State bond funds.

A report of the Director of Finance recommending that Council concur in the requests of the School Board, was also before the body.

Mr. Harris offered the following emergency budget ordinance:

(#35184-011601) AN ORDINANCE to amend and reordain certain sections of the 2000-2001 General, School and School Capital Projects Funds Appropriations, and providing for an emergency.

(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 64, page 85.)

Mr. Harris moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 35184-011601. The motion was seconded by Mr. Carder and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Bestpitch, Carder, Harris, Hudson, White, Wyatt and Mayor Smith-----7.

NAYS: None-----0.

REPORTS OF OFFICERS:

CITY MANAGER:

BRIEFINGS:

CITY GOVERNMENT: The City Manager presented a summary of the year 2000 Citizen Survey. She advised that the Roanoke City Citizens Survey is an effort of the City to uphold its commitment to service excellence for all customers; and as a part of its efforts to assess citizen satisfaction with City services, the Office of City Manager contracted with the Center for Survey Research at Virginia Tech to conduct a telephone survey that would represent the opinion of citizens residing in the four geographic quadrants comprising the City of Roanoke. She further advised that the questionnaire was divided into three general areas, viz: (1) how satisfied are you

with the four areas of Council's Vision Statement -- *Effective Government, Economy, Education and Quality of Life*, and the progress being made to achieve different goals designed to improve the City; (2) What is your opinion on service quality; and (3) general questions about customer service, attitudes toward government and demographics of the community.

She stated that residents gave the City high marks in almost all of the abovementioned areas, City staff is working on those areas that are of concern in order to reach a solution and future plans include conducting a survey to measure the City's success on an annual or bi-annual basis.

The City Manager introduced Susan Willis-Walton, Associate Director of Virginia Tech Center for Survey Research, to present an overview of survey results.

Ms. Walton advised that the instrument used for the study was a telephone survey designed to gather information about the opinions of Roanoke City citizens regarding a variety of City services and issues, and 1,017 calls were conducted during the period of September 1 - October 8, 2000.

Highlights of the survey include the following:

80% rated the City of Roanoke as either an excellent or good place to live;

75% rated the quality of life in the City as excellent or good and agreed that the overall quality and livability of neighborhoods in Roanoke is good.

80% reported that City government is somewhat or very effective in meeting community needs;

72.9% believe City government performance is improving in Roanoke;

64.9% rated the educational resources and opportunities available in the City as excellent or good;

64.1% rated the public schools in the City as either excellent or good;
60% agreed that City government helps existing businesses to grow;

65% agreed that Roanoke City government does a good job attracting new businesses to the City;

84.2% agreed that City government actively develops the downtown Roanoke area;

75% indicated that City government does a good job of promoting Roanoke as a tourist destination, as well as developing commercial and industrial areas in Roanoke.

46.9% rated the City government efforts to improve the local economy as excellent or good, and 41.9% rated the City's efforts as fair or poor;

78% rated police services as either excellent or good, with some citizens expressing concern regarding feelings of safety;

87% indicated that they are somewhat or very satisfied with the overall quality of services that the Roanoke City government provides;

65.8% reported that the services provided by the City of Roanoke are worth the taxes paid by citizens;

25.8% reported that they access the City's Internet web site called, "City Web" at least once per month;

63.1% agreed that the Roanoke City government can be trusted to do what is in the best interest of its citizens;

63.9% believed that they have the opportunity to contribute to the governance process in Roanoke;

Following discussion, questions and comments by the Members of Council, without objection by Council, the Mayor advised that the briefing would be received and filed.

ITEMS RECOMMENDED FOR ACTION:

SIDEWALKS/CURB AND GUTTER-DOWNTOWN ROANOKE, INCORPORATED:

The City Manager submitted a communication advising that Downtown Roanoke, Inc., (DRI) initiated a discussion with City staff earlier this year to form a partnership regarding the ownership and use of a sidewalk sweeping machine known as a "Green Machine", a state of the art machine designed to sweep, vacuum and scrub sidewalks in crowded urban areas; and DRI will purchase a "Green Machine" for \$24,000.00, in exchange for the City's commitment to regularly operate the machine in the downtown Service District, with a focus on the City market area, for three years, and an agreement to maintain and store the machine at the City's expense following purchase and delivery.

The City Manager recommended that she be authorized to execute an agreement with Downtown Roanoke, Incorporated.

Mr. Carder offered the following resolution

(#35185-011601) A RESOLUTION authorizing a contract with Downtown Roanoke, Inc., for the provision of certain services by the City in exchange for use of a sidewalk cleaning machine purchased by Downtown Roanoke, Inc., upon certain terms and conditions.

(For full text of Resolution, see Resolution Book No. 64, page 89.)

Mr. Carder moved the adoption of Resolution No. 35185-011601. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bestpitch and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Bestpitch, Carder, Harris, Hudson, White, Wyatt and Mayor Smith-----7.

NAYS: None-----0.

BUDGET-FIFTH DISTRICT EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING CONSORTIUM (FDETC): The City Manager submitted a communication advising that the Fifth District Employment and Training Consortium (FDETC) administers the Federally funded Workforce Investment Act (WIA) for the region, which encompasses the Counties of Alleghany, Botetourt, Craig, Franklin and Roanoke, as well as the Cities of Clifton Forge, Covington, Roanoke and Salem; and the FDETC serves two primary client populations:

dislocated workers who have been laid off from employment through no fault of their own, and

economically disadvantaged individuals as determined by household income guidelines set by the U. S. Department of Labor.

It was further advised that the City of Roanoke is the grant recipient and fiscal agent for FDETC funding, thus Council must appropriate funding for all grants and other monies received by the FDETC:

It was explained that Family Services of Roanoke Valley has entered into an agreement with the Consortium for job placement assistance to approximately 100 referrals from parole officers for Drug Court from November 1999 to October 2000; Family Services paid the Consortium \$19,795.00, or \$1,649.00 per month; Family Services requested, by letter, that the contract be extended through December 31, 2000, at the same rate of reimbursement – \$1,649.00 per month; and Family Services received additional funding for November and December 2000.

It was further explained that jurisdictions in the Fifth Planning District, which include the Cities of Salem, Clifton Forge, Covington and Roanoke, the Counties of Roanoke, Alleghany, Botetourt, Craig, and Franklin, were requested by the FDETC to contribute funds to offset the agency's administrative costs; and the City of Covington has sent a contribution of \$1,715.00 for fiscal year 2001.

The City Manager recommended that Council appropriate funds totaling \$5,013.00 and increase the revenue estimate by \$5,013.00 in accounts to be established in the Consortium Fund by the Director of Finance.

Mr. Hudson offered the following emergency budget ordinance:

(#35186-011601) AN ORDINANCE to amend and reordain certain sections of the 2000-2001 Consortium Fund Appropriations, and providing for an emergency.

(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 64, page 90.)

Mr. Hudson moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 35186-011601. The motion was seconded by Mr. Harris and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Bestpitch, Carder, Harris, Hudson, White, Wyatt and Mayor Smith-----7.

NAYS: None-----0.

BUDGET-GRANTS-LIBRARIES: The City Manager submitted a communication advising that the Roanoke Public Library has been awarded two grants by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, in the amounts of \$94,328.00 and \$43,118.00 respectively; the grant of \$94,329.00 is to be used to expand public access to computers and the Internet by purchasing computers and Internet connectivity equipment for the Gainsboro Branch, Jackson Park Branch, the Law Library, the Main Library and the Melrose Branch, and the Raleigh Court and Williamson Road Branches were not eligible for the grant; and the grant of \$43,118.00 is to be used for a regional training lab as a resource for staff and public training in computer use and applications at the Main Library.

The City Manager recommended that the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation grants be accepted and she be authorized to execute the requisite grant documents; that revenue estimates be established by the Director of Finance in the Capital Projects Fund, and that funds be appropriated in accounts to be established by the Director of Finance.

Mr. Harris offered the following emergency budget ordinance:

(#35187-011601) AN ORDINANCE to amend and reordain certain sections of the 2000-2001 Capital Projects Fund Appropriations, and providing for an emergency.

(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 64, page 91.)

Mr. Harris moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 35187-011601. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hudson and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Bestpitch, Carder, Harris, Hudson, White, Wyatt and Mayor Smith-----7.

NAYS: None-----0.

Mr. Harris offered the following resolution:

(#35188-011601) A RESOLUTION accepting a Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation Grant to the Roanoke Public Library for the purpose of expanding public access to computers and the Internet.

(For full text of Resolution, see Resolution Book No. 64, page 93.)

Mr. Harris moved the adoption of Resolution No. 35188-011601. The motion was seconded by Mr. Carder and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Bestpitch, Carder, Harris, Hudson, White, Wyatt and Mayor Smith-----7.

NAYS: None-----0.

Mr. Harris offered the following resolution:

(#35189-011601) A RESOLUTION accepting a Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation Grant to the Roanoke Public Library for the purpose of establishing a regional computer training lab.

(For full text of Resolution, see Resolution Book No. 64, page 93.)

Mr. Harris moved the adoption of Resolution No. 35189-011601. The motion was seconded by Mr. Carder and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Bestpitch, Carder, Harris, Hudson, White, Wyatt and Mayor Smith-----7.

NAYS: None-----0.

CITY CLERK:

COMMITTEES-SCHOOLS: A report of the City Clerk advising that pursuant to Chapter 9, Education, Code of the City of Roanoke (1979), as amended, establishing a procedure for the election of School Trustees, the three-year terms of office of Melinda J. Payne and Ruth C. Willson as Trustees of the Roanoke City School Board will expire on June 30, 2001.

It was further advised that pursuant to Section 9-16, of the City Code, on or before February 15 of each year, Council shall announce its intention to elect Trustees of the Roanoke City School Board for terms commencing July 1 through: (1) public announcement of such intention at two consecutive regular sessions of the Council and (2) advertisement of such intention in a newspaper of general circulation in the City twice a week for two consecutive weeks; Section 9-17 provides that applications must be filed in the City Clerk's Office by March 10 of each year, however, since March 10, 2002, falls on Saturday and City offices will be closed, the deadline for receipt of applications will be Friday, March 9 at 5:00 p.m; application forms will be available in the City Clerk's Office and may be obtained between the hours of 8:00 a.m., and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; and information describing the duties and responsibilities of School Trustees will also be available.

Without objection by Council, the Mayor advised that the report of the City Clerk would be received and filed.

DIRECTOR OF FINANCE:

AUDITS/FINANCIAL REPORTS-BUDGET: A report of the Director of Finance advising that Section 2-188.1, Reserve for self-insured liabilities, Code of the City of Roanoke (1979), as amended, stipulates that at the conclusion of each fiscal year, \$250,000.00, to the extent available from any undesignated General Fund balance at the end of such fiscal year, shall be reserved for self-insured liabilities of the City; the maximum balance of the reserve is three per cent of total General Fund appropriation for the concluded fiscal year; and as such, on June 30, 2000 \$25,000.00 was reserved in the General Fund for self-insured liabilities.

The Director of Finance recommended that Council approve appropriation of the \$250,000.00 reserved in the General Fund for self-insured liabilities to be transferred to the Risk Management Fund where the remaining self-insurance reserve exists; approve the establishment of a revenue estimate in the Risk Management Fund for the transfer and increase the Reserve for Self-Insured Liabilities.

Mr. Harris offered the following emergency budget ordinance:

(#35190-011601) AN ORDINANCE to amend and reordain certain sections of the 2000-2001 General and Risk Management Fund Appropriations, and providing for an emergency.

(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 64, page 94.)

Mr. Harris moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 35190-011601. The motion was seconded by Mr. Carder and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Bestpitch, Carder, Harris, Hudson, White, Wyatt and Mayor Smith-----7.

NAYS: None-----0.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES: NONE.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: NONE.

INTRODUCTION AND CONSIDERATION OF ORDINANCES AND RESOLUTIONS: NONE.

MOTIONS AND MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:

INQUIRIES AND/OR COMMENTS BY THE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF COUNCIL:

WATER RESOURCES: Council Member Hudson inquired about the level of water supply at the Carvins Cove Reservoir; whereupon, the City Manager advised that she would provide Council with the appropriate information.

CITY GOVERNMENT: Council Member Bestpitch commended the Mayor on the success of the first Roanoke Valley Leadership Summit which was held on Monday, January 8, 2001, at the Jefferson Center.

OTHER HEARING OF CITIZENS UPON PUBLIC MATTERS: The Mayor advised that Council sets this time as a priority for citizens to be heard, and matters requiring referral to the City Manager will be referred immediately for any necessary and appropriate response, recommendation or report to Council.

COMPLAINTS: Mr. Frank Spencer, 503 Bullitt Avenue, S. E., expressed concern with regard to the transient population in southeast Roanoke.

At 3:05 p.m., the Mayor declared the meeting in recess for continuation of a Closed Session.

At 7:00 p.m., on Tuesday, January 16, 2001, the regular meeting of City Council reconvened in the Roanoke City Council Chamber, fourth floor, Noel C. Taylor Municipal Building, 215 Church Avenue, S. W., City of Roanoke, with Vice-Mayor Carder presiding.

PRESENT: Council Members William D. Bestpitch, C. Nelson Harris, W. Alvin Hudson, Jr., William White, Sr., and Vice-Mayor William H. Carder. -----5.

ABSENT: Council Member Linda F. Wyatt and Mayor Ralph K. Smith-----2.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Darlene L. Burcham, City Manager; William M. Hackworth, City Attorney; James D. Grisso, Director of Finance; and Mary F. Parker, City Clerk.

COUNCIL: With respect to the Closed Meeting just concluded, Mr. Harris moved that each Member of City Council certify to the best of his or her knowledge that: (1) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements under the Virginia Freedom of Information Act; and (2) only such public business matters as were identified in any Closed Meeting were heard, discussed or considered by City Council. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bestpitch and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Bestpitch, Harris, Hudson, White and Vice-Mayor Carder-----5.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Mayor Smith and Council Member Wyatt were absent.)

The reconvened meeting was opened with a prayer by Council Member C. Nelson Harris.

The Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America was led by Vice-Mayor Carder.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

GRANTS-TRAFFIC: Pursuant to Resolution No. 25523 adopted by the Council of the City of Roanoke on Monday, April 6, 1981, the City Clerk having advertised a public hearing for Tuesday, January 16, 2001, at 7:00 p.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, to consider previously received applications for Federal funds made available through the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) for transportation enhancement projects in fiscal year 2001-02, the matter was before the body.

Legal advertisement of the public hearing was published in The Roanoke Times on Tuesday, January 2, 2001 and Tuesday, January 9, 2001; and in The Roanoke Tribune on Thursday, January 4, 2001.

A communication from the City Manager advising that the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) was signed into Federal law in June 1998, which action reauthorized the Federal surface transportation programs for six years, from fiscal year 1998 to 2003, replacing the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA); the law provides \$215 billion in spending authority for highways and transit, including \$3 billion for transportation enhancement projects; TEA-21 requires State departments for transportation to set aside ten per cent of their Surface Transportation Program (STP) allocation each year for transportation enhancements, which includes activities such as facilities for pedestrians and bicyclists (such as greenways) and rehabilitation of historic transportation buildings; and the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) held a public meeting regarding the TEA-21 enhancement program on November 16, 2000, was before Council.

It was further advised that any group, or individual, may initiate enhancement projects; however, City Council and the Metropolitan Planning Organization must endorse the applications prior to submittal to VDOT by the applicant on or before January 31, 2001; two enhancement project applications have been received; i.e.: the City of Roanoke and the Western Virginia Foundation for the Arts and Sciences; and the City Planning Commission received the requests on December 21, 2000, and submitted a recommendation to Council under separate cover.

The City Manager recommended that Council endorse, by separate resolution, project applications submitted by the City of Roanoke for gateway improvements within the Williamson Road corridor, and Western Virginia Foundation for the Arts and Sciences for renovation of the former Norfolk and Western Railway Passenger Station and agree to pay 20 per cent of the total cost for planning and design,

right-of-way and construction of the project; and if the City elects to cancel a project, the City would reimburse VDOT for the total amount of costs associated with any work completed on either project through the date of cancellation notice. The City Manager further recommended that she be authorized to execute, on behalf of the City, any City/State Agreements for project administration, subject to approval of project applications by VDOT, and that she be further authorized to execute, on behalf of the City, a legally binding agreement with the Western Virginia Foundation for the Arts and Sciences (WVFAS), subject to approval of the application by VDOT, requiring the Western Virginia Foundation for the Arts and Sciences to be fully responsible for its matching funds, as well as all other obligations undertaken by the City by virtue of the City/State Agreement.

Mr. White offered the following resolution:

(#35191-011601) A RESOLUTION requesting that the Commonwealth Transportation Board establish a project for gateway improvements within the Williamson Road corridor.

(For full text of Resolution, see Resolution Book No. 64, page 96.)

Mr. White moved the adoption of Resolution No. 35191-011601. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hudson.

The Vice-Mayor inquired if there were persons present who would like to address Council in connection with the matter. There being none, Resolution No. 35191-011601 was adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Bestpitch, Harris, Hudson, White, and Vice-Mayor Carder-----5.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Mayor Smith and Council Member Wyatt were absent.)

Mr. Harris offered the following resolution:

(#35192-011601) A RESOLUTION requesting that the Commonwealth Transportation Board establish a project for renovation of the former Norfolk & Western Railway Passenger Station.

(For full text of Resolution, see Resolution Book No. 64, page 97.)

Mr. Harris moved the adoption of Resolution No. 35192-011601. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bestpitch.

The Vice-Mayor inquired if there were persons present who would like to address Council in connection with the matter. There being none, Resolution No. 35192-011601 was adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Bestpitch, Harris, Hudson, White and Vice-Mayor Carder-----5.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Mayor Smith and Council Member Wyatt were absent.)

STATE HIGHWAYS: Pursuant to Resolution No. 25523 adopted by the Council of the City of Roanoke on Monday, April 6, 1981, the City Clerk having advertised a public hearing for Tuesday, January 16, 2001, at 7:00 p.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, to receive public comments regarding alternatives for the proposed I-73 Project, the matter was before the body.

Legal advertisement of the public hearing was published in The Roanoke Times on Thursday, January 11, 2001; Friday, January 12, 2001, and Sunday, January 14, 2001, and in The Roanoke Tribune on Thursday, January 11, 2001.

Robert K. Bengtson, Director of Public Works, presented an overview with regard to proposed I-73. He stated that there are a range of alternative routes for I-73 that are spread across Southwestern Virginia, one of which follows U. S. 460 from the West Virginia State line, to Roanoke, to U. S. 220 South, to North Carolina; and in October 1993, Council adopted a resolution urging the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) to support the general alignment through the Roanoke area, and out of this alignment, other local alternatives, i.e., the eastern and western routes have been generated.

Mr. Bengtson further advised that VDOT briefed Council in July 1998 and July 2000; the Draft Environmental Impact Statement evaluating various environmental and quality of life issues with regard to roadway alternatives has been completed and released by VDOT; and Council adopted the City's 2001 Legislative Program in December 2000 supporting the I-73 project as an important element in the economic future of the region.

The Vice-Mayor inquired if there were person present who would like to be heard in connection with the matter.

Michael Urbanski, Attorney representing the Rappaport Companies, appeared before Council on behalf of the owner of Towers Mall, and expressed concern with regard to proposed I-73 running through downtown Roanoke, which would eliminate direct southbound access off I-581 to Colonial Avenue and Towers Mall. He emphasized that Towers Mall is an important part of the economic tax base of the City, and the elimination of access to Colonial Avenue may result in the loss of sales for tenants and property values, and create a negative tax issue for the community, the neighborhood, and the City.

Mr. Winfred D. Noell, 2743 Northview Drive, S. W., spoke in opposition to the proposed I-73 project, and spoke in support of a transportation system management (TMS) alternative.

Mr. Brent Riley, 5280 Wade Road, Roanoke County, spoke in support of the TMS alternative, and expressed concern with regard to the proposed I-73 project being constructed along the western corridor of the City.

Mr. David Socky, 672 Woodbrook Drive, Roanoke County, spoke in support of the TMS alternative, and also expressed concern with regard to the construction of the proposed I-73 project along the western corridor of the City.

Mr. Howard Noel, 5712 Castle Rock Road, Roanoke County, spoke in support of the proposed I-73 project, and stated that the City of Roanoke is the economic heart of the Roanoke region, and construction of the I-73 project will ensure opportunities for the City by bringing better economic development to the Roanoke region.

Mr. Fredrick ("Rick") Williams, 3125 Sunrise Avenue, N. W., spoke in opposition to corridor alignments for the proposed I-73 project, and expressed support for the TSM alternative. He cited reasons of safety issues, air quality, construction disruptions in downtown Roanoke and the impact on surrounding businesses and residential areas, decrease in property values in neighborhoods such as Washington Park, Gainsboro, and Belmont, etc. He further stated that the broader urban impact is that the proposed I-73 project will encourage more low density sprawling growth at Roanoke's perimeter and will produce additional urban blight, as well as continue to disproportionately affect the disadvantaged and elderly citizens.

Matt Kennell, President, Downtown Roanoke, Inc., presented a resolution unanimously adopted by the Board of Directors in support of the billed alternative central alignment as the best route for proposed I-73. He also presented copies of correspondence from downtown businesses expressing concern with regard to the proposed project and the potential impact it could have on businesses in downtown Roanoke.

Ms. Ann Rogers, P. O. Box 14224, proposed a series of round table discussions between Downtown Roanoke, Inc., the Roanoke Regional Chamber of Commerce, the City of Roanoke, Virginians for Appropriate Roads, I-73 Regional Impact Network, representatives of the Virginia Department of Transportation, and other interested stakeholders to develop a more agreeable design.

Ms. V. Lee Wolfe, President, Gainsboro Neighborhood Alliance, spoke in opposition to the I-73 project, and referenced correspondence presented to Council in August 2000 which expressed the concerns of the Gainsboro Neighborhood Alliance relative to the I-73 project.

Mr. Mark Pederson, 1210 Penmar Avenue, S. E., stated that VDOT has failed, as a neutral agency, to thoroughly research alternatives available to citizens, government and municipalities that will be affected by the I-73 project; and suggested that Council hire Todd Litton, a transportation engineering consultant from Canada, who works on TSM and TDM proposals to provide additional input with regard to alternatives.

Mr. Bill Dandridge, 2620 Rosalind Avenue, S. W., spoke in support of the TSM alternative, and expressed concern with regard to the negative affect on area watersheds and ridge lines, and a decrease in beautification of the area.

Mr. Bobby Meadows, President, Belmont Preservation Association, spoke in opposition to the proposed I-73 project, and suggested that the City repair existing roads.

Mr. Allen Childress, 6549 Masons View Lane, Roanoke County, spoke in support of the TMS alternative, and stated that the dogleg of proposed I-73 to Roanoke is for economic development purposes and direct access to the Roanoke Regional Airport. He further stated that taxpayers of the Commonwealth of Virginia would have to pay 20 per cent of the \$1.47 billion, and the TSM alternative cost is \$146 million, or one-tenth of the cost of the interstate project. He suggested that some of the features of the TSM alternative would be beneficial and it is incumbent upon the taxpayers to look at money issues.

John McGonigal, Member, Southeast Action Forum and Belmont Preservation Association, spoke in support of a modified version of I-73 and the TSM.

Mr. Clark Thomas, 740 Arbutus Avenue, S. E., spoke in support of an enhanced version of the TSM alternative, and opposed any type of road through the southeast quadrant of Roanoke City.

Mr. Preston Hoffman, 402 Washington Avenue, S. W., spoke in opposition to the proposed I-73 project which would increase traffic volume, air pollution and traffic fatalities on Route 220 and I-81. He proposed improvements to U. S. Route 220.

Kathy Hill, President, Riverland Alert Neighborhoods, read a prepared statement in support of the TSM alternative. She called attention to the Vision Statement adopted by Council, Quality of Life, which states that Roanoke will be a community for every person, and every family is important and respected, Roanoke will be a community of stable, safe, caring and friendly neighborhoods, and Roanoke will protect the natural environment and promote cultural, social and recreational opportunities that encourage present and future generations to choose Roanoke as their home. She urged that Council oppose the I-73 project.

Mr. Alan Gleiner, Chair, I-73 Regional Impact, spoke in support of the TSM alternative which will improve the efficiency and safety of I-581 and U. S. Route 220 without the destruction of homes, businesses and farmland that may occur in connection with the proposed I-73 project. He proposed that a committee be appointed composed of concerned citizen groups, the Roanoke Regional Chamber of Commerce, and Council to study a proposal that could bring a resolution to the issue.

Evelyn D. Bethel, President, Historic Gainsboro Preservation District, Inc., read from the City's Vision Statement on Effective Government which provides that government will be participatory, responsive and efficient, valuing diverse community involvement, public/private partnerships and regional cooperation and citizens will be involved in the establishment of community priorities. She advised that Gainsboro residents sent letters and petitions to VDOT regarding I-73 and urged that Council vote against I-73, especially through the central part of the City of Roanoke.

Ms. Kristen Pechman, 831 Webster Drive, Roanoke County, spoke in opposition to the I-73 project and urged Council to support the TSM alternative, which would make a new interstate unnecessary.

Mr. E. Duane Howard, 508 Walnut Avenue, S. W., spoke in opposition to the I-73 project, and urged that Council support the TSM alternative.

Mr. Peter Johnson, Jr., 4758 Martinelle Avenue, Roanoke County, spoke in opposition to I-73, and suggested the creation of village centers with businesses. He suggested keeping roads natural rather than constructing interstates.

Ms. Suzanne Osborne, 1702 Blair Road, S. W., spoke in opposition to the proposed I-73 project, and expressed support of the TSM alternative.

Edwin Hall, Member, Roanoke Regional Chamber of Commerce, spoke on behalf of the Regional Chamber in support of the I-73 project, citing safety and economics as two major reasons. Mr. Hall advised that safety, the greatest savings of life, have occurred on higher levels of interstates in the highway system; there are 17 locations along U. S. Route 220 with critical accident ratings ranging from 132 to 1,138; VDOT calculates critical accident rates based on the number of accidents per 100 million vehicles traveled, the acceptable threshold for a critical accident rate on U. S. 220 is 112; and Virginia's economic dependence on highways is the 9th highest among the nation of all states. He further advised that every \$1 billion invested in transportation infrastructure generates more than \$2 billion in economic activity; each \$1 billion invested in building and upgrading the nation's highways since 1950 reduced highway fatalities by 1,400 over 40 years and saved the American society over \$2 billion in health care insurance, lost wages and productivity costs; and potential economic benefits of I-73 would save commuting time, increase productivity from commuter time savings, save travel time for businesses, transportation costs, increase short term jobs during construction, increase jobs in existing industry, create new jobs through location, increase annual gross regional product, personal income, population, housing, revenue from real estate taxes, and state and local taxes. He stated that the TSM option includes only minor improvements between Tanglewood Mall and Boones Mill, such as sight distance, median extensions, rebuilding of a 1,200 foot and a 3,200 foot stretch which would help with safety issues, but would not increase adequate capacity for current traffic levels.

For clarification purposes, Council Member Harris commented that Council has no authority with regard to the proposed I-73 project, and the purpose of the public hearing is to receive citizen input.

Mr. Bestpitch emphasized that Council's responsibility is to represent the concerns of its constituents on issues that have been identified as problems or potential problems associated with the proposed I-73. He suggested that another work session be scheduled with VDOT to allow Council, as representatives of the citizens, to have an opportunity to ask questions before making a final recommendation.

The Vice-Mayor inquired if there were other persons who would like to be heard in connection with the matter. There being none, he declared the public hearing closed.

HEARING OF CITIZENS: The Vice-Mayor advised that Council sets this time as a priority for citizens to be heard, it is a time for citizens to speak and a time for Council to listen and matters requiring referral to the City Manager will be referred immediately for any necessary and appropriate response, recommendation or report to Council.

COMPLAINTS-NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATIONS: Bobby Meadows, President, Historic Belmont Preservation Association, and presented copy of a communication from Eric Branscom, Attorney, representing the Historic Belmont Preservation Association, addressed to the Executive Director of the Roanoke Rescue Mission, setting forth concerns with regard to the proposed expansion of the Rescue Mission. He advised that the Belmont Preservation Association recommends that Historic Belmont have an active and productive partnership with the Rescue Mission, and that the Rescue Mission participate in various activities and programs to improve the quality of life in the neighborhood, such as neighborhood cleanup projects, neighborhood beautification projects, and active involvement with crime prevention activities.

Without objection by Council, the Vice-Mayor advised that the remarks and communication would be referred to the City Manager.

There being no further business, at 8:55 p.m., the Vice-Mayor declared the meeting in recess, to be reconvened on Monday, January 29, 2001, at 7:00 p.m., in the City Council Chamber, at which time the Council will receive public input on two options to be considered by Council regarding Victory Stadium.

The Council meeting reconvened on Monday, January 29, 2001, at 7:00 p.m., in the City Council Chamber, Fourth Floor, Noel C. Taylor Municipal Building, 215 Church Avenue, S. W., City of Roanoke, Virginia, with Mayor Ralph K. Smith presiding.

PRESENT: Council Members William D. Bestpitch, William H. Carder, W. Alvin Hudson, Jr., William White, Sr., Linda F. Wyatt, and Mayor Ralph K. Smith-----6.

ABSENT: Council Member C. Nelson Harris-----1.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Darlene L. Burcham, City Manager; William M. Hackworth, City Attorney; Jesse A. Hall, Director of Finance; and Mary F. Parker, City Clerk.

The meeting was opened with a prayer by Mayor Ralph K. Smith.

The Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America was led by Mayor Smith.

The Mayor advised that the purpose of the meeting is to hold a public hearing to receive public input and comment on two options that the Council is considering with regard to Victory Stadium.

Legal advertisement of the public hearing was published in *The Roanoke Times* on January 12, 2001 and January 21, 2001.

The two options under consideration by the Council are as follows:

Option 1: Maintain half of the existing stadium and add a stage and use the stadium for sports and concerts. The concepts involving this option consist of the following:

9,000 seats, primary one - sided stadium; 8,000 bench seats and 1,000 telescopic risers;
20,000 seats for amphitheater set up (9,000 permanent bench seats and 11,000 portable chairs or lawn seats)
Soccer, football fields
New press facilities, East side supports concert functions
New, state-of-the-art permanent side stage
Field, stage, support facilities raised above 100 year flood plain
Telescoping "side stage" seats for sports in Stage House

Estimated cost: **\$14,470,000.00**

Option 2: Demolish entire stadium and construct a new stadium and stage for sports and concert uses. The concepts involving this option consist of the following:

8,000 seats; primarily one-sided stadium (7,000 permanent chairs and 1,000 telescopic risers)
19,000 seats for amphitheater set up (8,000 permanent chairs and 11,000 portable chairs or lawn seating)
Stadium axis rotated to maximize all uses relative to sun angles
Soccer, football fields
New press facilities, North side supports concert functions
New, state-of-the-art permanent side stage, South side
Field, stage, concourse, support facilities raised above 100 year flood plain
Telescoping "side stage" seats for sports in stage house

Estimated Cost: **\$17,725,604.00**

The Mayor advised that inasmuch as 19 persons had signed up to speak, each speaker would be requested to limit their remarks to three minutes.

Mr. Jim Fields, 17 Ridge Crest Road, Hardy, Virginia, advised that Victory Stadium should be saved because it is one of the finest stadiums and one of the best structures of its kind anywhere in the United States. He referred to other structures in Roanoke that should have been preserved as a part of Roanoke's history, and advised that additions could be made to Victory Stadium on both sides of the facility, and grandstand seats could be added at the site where the National Guard Army is currently located. He stated that with renovations in the range of \$7 - 10 million, Victory Stadium could become a facility that the entire City would be proud of, and with proper marketing efforts, promoters will book events at Victory Stadium and bring money into the City's coffers.

Mr. Mark Burton, 2235 Sherwood Avenue, S. W., advised that at some point in time, a consensus will be reached on whether the City will spend a considerable sum of money on renovating a stadium, or tearing it down, etc.; and certain proposals have been submitted, which he does not necessarily agree with; whereupon, he inquired as to the process that was used, the consultants that were interviewed and their credentials insofar as athletic field maintenance, stadium maintenance, special event venues, and the functionality with the existing facility or a new facility; did the City Manager talk with major users of the existing facilities, such as the Department of Parks and Recreation which stores equipment at Victory Stadium that is used daily in maintenance of the City's rights-of-way; did the City Manager talk with the members of the Special Events Committee, or to the American Cancer Society in regard to its involvement with Relay for Life, or to Festival in the Park representatives, or to representatives of Roanoke Catholic High School, or to representatives of the National Guard Armory. He referred to the history of Victory Stadium and the nostalgia of citizens of the Roanoke Valley associated with the facility.

Ms. Freida Tate, 2715 10th Street, N. W., spoke in support of a referendum to allow citizens an opportunity to vote on the fate of Victory Stadium, or construction of a new stadium/amphitheater. She advised that the past is what Roanoke is built on and urged that Council vote to renovate Victory Stadium and look to the future, while restoring a historic facility of the past.

Mr. Bill Ammen, 4938 Greenlee Road, S. W., requested that Council reconsider its decision made on December 18, 2000, and submit all three options for Victory Stadium to a public referendum, because it is unfair for five of a seven member Council to decide such a mammoth issue. He referred to a recent article in *The Roanoke Times* that contained the following headline: "Roanoke School Board Expresses Disappointment, Victory Stadium Plans Blasted"; and one member of the School Board was quoted as saying, "I am disappointed that it is being set up No. 1 for entertainment, and No. 2 for students", and "this is not a stadium for athletics but is an amphitheater used for athletics". He referred to a recent issue of *The Roanoker Magazine* which reported that on Thanksgiving Day 1942, at the annual

football game between VPI and VMI and in the presence of the Corps of Cadets for both schools and a stadium filled with football fans and dignitaries, Victory Stadium "was committed to the glory of God for the complete and permanent victory of America and her allies." He stated that in 1942, Americans were fighting for their lives in North Africa, the Pacific, and all over Europe and victory was not certain; therefore, he asked if Victory Stadium is demolished, or one-half of the structure is torn down, what will be the message that will be sent to all of the thousands of brave men who laid down their lives, or were wounded fighting for this complete and permanent victory over Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan.

Mr. Chris Craft, 1501 East Gate Avenue, N. E., spoke in support of saving Victory Stadium in its current condition and urged that a public referendum be held to allow taxpayers to vote on the issue. He stated that five members of Council voted on the issue on December 18 which does not necessarily represent the wishes of the majority of the citizens of Roanoke; and Council is elected to represent all taxpayers of Roanoke and to take their input and wishes into consideration. He referred to other historic structures in Roanoke that were demolished and questioned the legacy that will be left for Roanoke's future generations if Roanoke's historic structures continue to be torn down rather than renovated. He referred to successful efforts by the City and others to renovate Jefferson High School and The Hotel Roanoke and advised that the same could be done for Victory Stadium.

Mr. John Graybill, 2443 Tillett Road, S. W., advised that any Member of Council who voted on the prevailing side could move to reconsider the vote which was taken on December 18 and allow Victory Stadium to be preserved which is the desire of the majority of the citizens of the City of Roanoke. He further advised that voters are not simply speaking to the issue of nostalgia for the good old days, but a concern about what will happen to Victory Stadium in the future. He stated that Victory Stadium will be used for football games and for other purposes if it is renovated and properly marketed by the City, and the necessary funds should be invested by the City to address daily maintenance needs of the facility.

Mr. Charles Price, 3101 Willow Road, N. W., spoke in opposition to Council's vote which was taken on December 18, but advised that he would approach the issue from a different perspective. He stated that since moving back to Roanoke, he has been involved with the youth of the area through recreational ball for approximately 20 years and it is appalling that the City of Roanoke has not respected that portion of Roanoke's society by requiring Roanoke's youth to use "second fiddle" type facilities for football and soccer. He stated that Roanoke is the largest city west of Richmond, yet it has the poorest facility of any locality. He called attention to the pride of young people who have had the opportunity to participate in sports activities at Victory Stadium and the City should continue to nurture the pride

of its young citizens. He referred to the City's lack of maintenance of Victory Stadium over the past 15 - 20 years and now there is the threat of taking away the heritage of many Roanokers. He requested that Council reconsider its December 18 vote and authorize renovation of Victory Stadium.

Ms. Sarah Lee, 4139 Appleton Avenue, N. W., President, William Fleming Student Government Association, and Captain of the William Fleming Cheerleading Team, read a letter from a fellow student who could not attend the meeting, but would like to speak in support of a newer playing field and an up to date track facility. She advised that the student is concerned with the lack of seating capacity and showers, poor seating mechanisms, sanitation issues, and the condition of locker rooms; therefore, he requests that the City investigate his concerns and that Victory Stadium be renovated. From the standpoint of a cheerleader, Ms. Lee advised that since no track facility is included in the proposed new stadium, where will cheerleaders be stationed during games, will fans be seated on the same side of the stadium, and will the band and cheerleaders be stationed on one side of the stadium. She further advised that the track team has inquired if it would be possible to construct an all weather track that would bring additional revenue to the City by providing a facility to accommodate large track events. As a cheerleader, she stated that she has had the opportunity to travel across the state and facilities throughout the State of Virginia are much better than Roanoke's; Patrick Henry and William Fleming High Schools have no home advantage because they must share Victory Stadium; and if a new stadium/amphitheater is constructed, local high school sports teams want to know if there will be a guarantee that they will have the facilities that are necessary to compete with other sports teams in Virginia.

Mr. Richard Kepley, 550 Kepplewood Road, S. E., expressed pride when he visits The Hotel Roanoke or The Jefferson Center because of the City's efforts to renovate and to preserve the structures, which could also be done for Victory Stadium because Roanokers are proud of their stadium. He advised that at one point it was thought that Victory Stadium was structurally unsound, but it has been found that such is not the case, and the facility can be used for many years to come; whereupon, he called attention to the expenditure by the City of over \$150,000.00 to secure the brick, over \$30,000.00 to install an irrigation system, \$40,000.00 to \$50,000.00 to install new metal bleachers and now there is discussion about demolishing the facility. He spoke in support of holding a public referendum to allow the citizens of Roanoke to vote on the fate of Victory Stadium, thus taking Council off the hook. He stated that a new stadium/amphitheater needs more study, and referred to another option; i.e.: consider a second stadium that seats between 5,000 and 6,000 persons along with a track facility, retain Victory Stadium and invest the necessary funds over the next five to ten years to renovate the facility.

Dr. J. Keith Bohon, 5012 Cave Spring Circle, S. W., spoke in support of renovating Victory Stadium because the facility is a part of Roanoke's past and should be preserved for Roanoke's future generations. He stated that Victory Stadium was dedicated for the glory of God and to the victory in Europe for our country; and Victory Stadium was born on November 26, 1942, Thanksgiving Day, and died on December 18, 2000, by a 5 - 2 vote of the Council. He advised that a stadium is a field, the Greek meaning is linear measurement of a field, with stands and rising tiers for spectators, and a stadium is basically intended for the purpose of holding athletic events; therefore, a good turf cannot be maintained while allowing other types of activities to occur. He stated that if Victory Stadium had been properly maintained by the City over the past 20 years, it would not be in its current state of disrepair.

Mr. William Bova, 2334 Idavere Road, S. W., spoke in support of a new stadium and advised that he was pleased that the Council has moved forward on the issue. He stated that the issue centers around Roanoke's youth, its high school students and athletic teams that need an adequate facility on which to play sports. He referred to the pride of Roanoke Valley residents in such facilities as the new baseball stadium and the new high school football stadium in the City of Salem; Roanoke County is beginning to move forward with the City of Salem on a new water park, and it is time for the City of Roanoke to move forward with a stadium such as the proposal for a mixed use facility. He stated that many Roanokers favor some type of new facility which could be viewed as an economic development tool that would coincide with the new biotechnology center. Therefore, he asked that Council do everything it can to move forward with the idea of a new stadium/amphitheater facility in the Orange Avenue/Williamson Road area.

Mr. Robert Gravely, 1412 Moorman Road, N. W., advised that proposals have been submitted that did not involve the citizens of Roanoke, or the City's work force. He stated that Victory Stadium is in its present state of disrepair because it was not properly maintained by the City for many years. He spoke in support of the expenditure of funds to renovate Victory Stadium rather than to spend taxpayer's money to construct a new stadium/amphitheater, and advised that Victory Stadium will be used if it is marketed properly by the City and will add revenue to the City's coffers. He stated that the citizens of Roanoke should be given the opportunity to vote on the fate of Victory Stadium through a public referendum.

Ms. Evelyn D. Bethel, 35 Patton Avenue, N. E., spoke in support of renovating Victory Stadium for creative re-use. She stated that citizens with historic connections to Roanoke think about how much poorer the City would be without the Harrison Museum of African-American Culture or the historic Gainsboro Branch Library; therefore, Council is implored to maintain and to renovate Victory Stadium. She advised that throughout the meetings regarding the City's Comprehensive Plan, Vision 2001-2020, citizens repeatedly talked about bringing young people to the area,

and the need for technology and better jobs; therefore, assuming that those goals are met, why would the City consider demolishing a 25,000 seat stadium to build a facility that has less than 10,000 seating capacity at a time when the City says it wants growth. She called attention to the number of persons who have asked the City to keep and to renovate Victory Stadium and to make the facility useable for Roanoke's youth who will have a greater love of Victory Stadium than any new facility that might be constructed by the City.

Mr. Adam Peters, 3943 Bosworth Drive, S. W., advised that a new high tech sports complex is a necessity for each high school in the City of Roanoke, and will enhance the image of Roanoke as a progressive city and help to bring business partners to the area. He stated that the field of the new stadium should be of north-south orientation. He spoke to the importance of the addition of a track facility and expansion of the visitors section to at least 2,500-3,000 seats, which is necessary to separate opposing fans and students and represents a safety issue. He also spoke to the importance of including a track facility in the multi functional sports and entertainment complex because building a track at a separate location without the required seating capacity to host district and regional meets will not be cost efficient; and providing one location that can host all athletic events will build pride and a sense of unity for all athletes using the facility.

Mr. Raymond Kessler, 3540 Hartland Road, S. W., requested more information on construction costs, maintenance costs, parking issues, and costs associated with shuttle buses. He advised that after all of the figures are publicized, citizens can reach their own conclusions and they should be allowed to vote their preference through a public referendum.

Mr. Tom Bradley, 809 Williamson Road, N. W., advised that Victory Stadium was dedicated to the memory of World War II veterans, the stadium is a part of Roanoke's history and should be preserved for future generations.

Mr. Woody Deans, 2847 Woodthrush Drive, S. W., Athletic Director, Patrick Henry High School, advised that it has been stated by some persons that sports is the primary issue regarding Victory Stadium; and in order for such to be the case, two major things need to occur with whatever option is selected. He stated that first is the need to construct a track facility inside Victory Stadium; there has been much discussion about a multi-use facility and spending more than \$1 million to move to another location that is less desirable and will be outdated by the time it is constructed; and it has been stated by an official of the Virginia High School League that in order to host any type of regional or state track meet at least 2,500 to 3,000 people must be in attendance, therefore, the proposed facility would be out of use the minute it is constructed if a 600 seat track is built; and the needs of cheerleaders would also be served if a track is built inside the stadium. He added that it is also important to equally balance the seating on both sides of the field, which could be done with either option; currently, the gates are closed at football games so that

fans cannot move back and forth from side to side for safety reasons and if both teams are placed on the same side, a security issue will be created. He stated that another important point is that the field should run north to south, all football fields are set up in that manner, most games are played during late afternoons and early evenings, and although spectators looking into the sun are uncomfortable, a poor playing environment would be created for athletes looking into the sun.

Mr. Steve Willson, 2651 Creston Avenue, S. W., a member of the Patrick Henry High School Boosters Club, spoke on behalf of those athletes who will use the playing field and reiterated the remarks of Coach Deans that field access is important; and there is a need for visitors side seating as well as a home side with perhaps lesser seats on the visitors side. He stated that he has no preference as to renovating or rebuilding Victory Stadium; Victory Stadium with an essentially brand new facility can still be Victory Stadium and serve as a memorial and a monument to World War II veterans; the present stadium, lighting, restrooms, dressing rooms, concession facilities, wiring, are all of third world quality; and more extensive renovations are needed than just a few coats of paint or installing new pipes, all of which should be thoroughly reviewed before reaching the conclusion that renovation is a feasible option. He stated that his main concern is that the Council will give at least as much consideration to the athletic needs of Roanoke's high school students as it gives to revenue building possibilities and the need for a concert site.

Mr. Danny Smith, 3593 Peakwood Drive, S. W., spoke from the standpoint of a sports enthusiast, a sports participant and a sports observer. He advised that the issue is whether the community will support whatever decision is made and take pride in whatever facility is constructed. He concurred in the remarks of a previous speaker that facilities in Victory Stadium are of a "third world" quality, and major renovations will be required. He stated that Roanokers should be able to take pride in the types of sports facilities that are offered for their use and for persons visiting the area from other localities, some of which have better playing facilities than Roanoke. He added that Victory Stadium is in a good location, it is a sound facility and it should be turned into the type of facility that Roanokers can take pride in.

Mr. Douglas Turner, 545 Highland Avenue, S. W., recommended the appointment of a citizens commission, including persons with experience in renovating structures, to determine costs. He advised that from the perspective of an individual who renovates structures for his livelihood, he can attest to the fact that in most cases it is less expensive to renovate than to construct something new, therefore, he encouraged Council to consider the renovation of Victory Stadium.

Mr. Stuart B arbour, 9 27 R iverland R oad, S . E ., c alled a ttention t o p ublic meetings where citizens were given the opportunity to review the various alternatives and to provide input. He advised that upon assuming her position, the new City Manager engaged the services of Rosser International to develop various options. He stated that currently, there is nothing wrong with Victory Stadium that new lights and new locker rooms will not cure, and it is hard to believe that it will be necessary to spend over \$16 million to renovate Victory Stadium. He added that the stadium/amphitheater concept is ill conceived, the facts have been misrepresented and it is wrong not to renovate Victory Stadium.

Mr. J. Granger Macfarlane, 2402 Woodcliffe Road, S. E., advised that Victory Stadium is currently in a state of disrepair and needs to be refurbished and updated, and ultimately aggressively and properly marketed by the City. He commended the City Manager for placing the stadium under the purview of the management of the Roanoke Civic Center because Civic Center staff has marketing expertise. He suggested that a referendum be conducted in November, pursuant to Section 24.2-684.1, Code of Virginia, 1950, which calls for a special referendum, and advised that his reason for suggesting a public referendum is that when the overall estimate of a high ticket item or project exceeds \$15 - 20 million, such action calls for more formal public input and public participation, especially in an area where there is such an emotional decision at hand. He encouraged Council Members to be of political courage, and advised that the issue can be re-analyzed if it is felt that some additional background protection is needed, the referendum can take the form of an advisory referendum, rather than a bonding referendum, and there is ample opportunity, both in time and from the standpoint of good solid business judgment, to give more thorough consideration to such a large and expensive project.

Ms. Kathy Hill, 509 Arbor Avenue, S. E., spoke in support of renovating Victory Stadium. She expressed concern that the facility has been allowed to reach its current state of disrepair because sufficient funds were not appropriated by the City. She stated that she has followed the issue very closely and has continued to be in favor of renovation of Victory Stadium, but since it appears that that is no longer an option she would favor Option No. 1 that allows saving one-half of Victory Stadium for use. She added that it is important to listen to the concerns of Roanoke's high school students in regard to the poor sound system and the condition of restrooms and concession facilities. She advised that money should be spent on improving these conditions now instead of waiting until it is decided to tear down half of the stadium and to renovate the other half. She concurred in the remarks of previous speakers regarding the need for a public referendum to allow the citizens of Roanoke to vote on the fate of Victory Stadium. She stated that the necessary funds should be invested in the Roanoke Civic Center now so that it, too, will not fall into a state of disrepair.

Ms. Tiffany Curtis, 1309 Guildford Avenue, N. W., spoke in support of renovating Victory Stadium as soon as possible, and that Council give further consideration to including a track facility at the new structure. She inquired as to how an amphitheater would benefit Roanoke's teenagers, what type of activities will be held for teenagers in the facility and why was the renovated track taken out of the new stadium/amphitheater proposal. She asked that the youth of Roanoke be considered when the final decision is made by Council.

Mr. Robert Wells, 2011 Memorial Avenue, S. W., Apartment B, spoke in support of construction of an amphitheater. He advised that when he moved to Roanoke, he was amazed that the City did not have this type of facility which causes Roanokers to travel to other localities where entertainment venues of this nature are available. He stated that another option could be a temporary structure to accommodate a concert series at Victory Stadium which would cost approximately \$100,000.00 for a six month season, not including union labor and other associated costs.

Mr. Burch Sweeney, 3605 Heritage Road, S. W., advised that Victory Stadium is approximately 58 years old; the last big time college football game, VMI and VPI, was played in Roanoke about 33 years ago and there is nothing that will entice Virginia Tech to leave Lane Stadium and come back to Roanoke. He stated that society and entertainment venues, in general, have changed over the years; in the past, Roanoke could fill 25,000 seats in Victory Stadium, but that cannot be done in today's world because concert promoters will not come to Roanoke, especially during the summer season; and most concerts in major cities are held in outdoor venues that are true amphitheaters. He added that the City of Roanoke should invest its money wisely and provide not only a new sports facility, but a multi-purpose facility where concerts can be held which will enable the City to offset operating costs. He stated that Roanoke's students and athletes deserve and need a new facility; those persons who fought in World War II should continue to be recognized and a new Victory Stadium would fulfill both purposes. As managers and leaders of the City, he asked that Council give Roanoke's students and citizens a new Victory Stadium, while continuing to recognize the sacrifices of the World War II generation.

Ms. Rebecca Sweeney, 3605 Heritage Road, S. W., spoke in support of demolishing Victory Stadium and constructing a new facility. She stated that the proposed plan, along with a playing field on the north-south axis, would best benefit those athletes and citizens that use Victory Stadium; the plan would effectively address a change in seating arrangements to 6,000 - 7,000 seats on the side opposite the amphitheater and approximately 2,000 seats on the actual amphitheater side; and along with an eight lane all weather track, the proposal would provide all citizens and specifically high school and middle school athletes with a state-of-the-art sports and concert venue.

Mr. Ron Cronise, 4001 Lake Drive, S. W., President, Patrick Henry High School Boosters Club, reiterated the remarks of Coach Woody Deans and other representatives of the high school athletic community. He stated that he has not heard anyone say that they do not favor taking some type of action; therefore, it is requested that Council expedite the process leading to a facility that the Roanoke Valley and, in particular, the athletic community will support. He added that those items that were presented by high school athletes, their parents and other members of the Boosters Clubs are of primary concern and importance to the program; however, he asked that the matter not be delayed for another year before some action is taken. He advised that Council's serious and honest consideration and action will be greatly appreciated by the majority of Roanoke's population.

The Mayor advised that in the interest of time, no formal presentation would be made by the City Manager on the options under consideration by Council.

There being no further speakers, the Mayor declared the meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

A P P R O V E D

ATTEST:

Mary F. Parker
City Clerk

Ralph K. Smith
Mayor
